

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is requested in view of below responses.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination and office action thereof.

1. Responses to notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated on 1/182006, applicant adds this remarks. This amendment and remarks combine applicant's response letter dated on October 7 and October 25. The amendment of claim is based on vision of applicant's letter of "amendment and reply to office action" dated on February 15, 2005. Below response is coordinated with the examiner's action number of office action latter dated on July 25, 2005.

### Clarification to Inventor Name

2. The corrected inventor name is Zhongze Bai. Actually in US passport the name is Zhongze Gordon Bai. That will be perfect if it can be changed to this legal name which is Zhongze Gordon Bai.
3. Appreciate for the approval of drawings.

### Objection to the Claim

4. Applicant amends claims and use "target unit" instead of "fixed target unit".
5. Change "target signal" to "signal" in line 5, 10, 11, 14, 16 of claim 12.
6. Change "said signal's" to "said guiding signal's" in line 19 of claim 25.
7. Applicant amend claim 1, 2, 12, 25, 27 and 28.
8. Appreciate the Examiner's withdrawing of objection to claim 28.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC Sec. 103

9. The present invention is rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and will show the difference between applicant's invention and others as below chart.

<b>Application's Invention</b>	<b>Other Patents</b>
“Transmitting signal from the target location”. It means transmitter (target unit) is installed or carried on target entity, such as in the building's top of a McDonald restaurant, a child's packet.	Transmit signal from communication station which has target's information.
Get direction by finding SINGAL of transmitter's physical location.	Get direction by transferring target's geographical data.
Receiving which target unit's signal depends on which target unit broadcasts respected target's unique code, such as a restroom code, a Holiday Inn code.	Receiving signal form closed communication station then transfer mobile unit's requirement to search on database for target's information.
Without GPS	Using GPS
The target could be mobile and real time tracking since transmitter is carried by target unit.	The target cannot move often and be tracked real time since target's geographical data is installed in database
Without Database and exchange information to calculate direction	Using Database and exchange information to calculate direction

- A) Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10, 12, 14, 16-26 and 29 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC Sec. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi (USPN 60097313) in view of Snapp (US 2003/0069693A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and will explain as follows.

In general, the present invention is for find direction, Takahashi's invention is for exchange information. The present invention gets direction by looking where the signal coming from, Takahashi's invention gets direction by comparing position data

Comparing present application with others, there are 6 different points.

1. The present invention uses target code to identify and select which transmitter it should communicate with first.

2. The present invention's tracking unit calculates the bearing from the signal transmitted by respected target (through target unit).
3. The present invention's transmitter (target unit) is installed or carried by target entity. In other words: present target unit is the destination, whereas Takahashi points us to another location.
4. The present invention's target unit is the sign of position.
5. The present invention does not rely on GPS.
6. In the present invention, it is calculating the bearing and distance between the target unit and the tracking unit. In Takahashi's patent, it is "giving" you the distance to the actual destination.

Regarding **Claim 1**, applicant amended to avoid the references.

Regarding **Claim 2**, applicant's argument is below:

The present invention uses target code to identify and select which transmitter it should to communicate first (see claim 2 lines 5-16; description [0023]-[0024]). Takahashi and Snapp's looks for closed data access point (communication unit) and transfer information when vehicle requires and the data access point allows (see Takahashi's col.11, lines 36-42. see Snapp's [0037], lines 1-4;[0048]). Therefore, applicant's claim 2 line 13 of "if said broadcast signal matches said target code, start to calculate ..." is different processing then Takahashi and Snapp's.

The present invention's tracking unit calculates the bearing from the signal transmitted by respected target (through target unit) (see claim 2, lines 13-16). Takahashi and Snapp's invention gets direction by comparing target (service provider) and vehicle's position information (see Takahashi's col. 28, lines 16-24. See Snapp's [0028, 0038]).

By all appearance, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's statement on examiner's 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph of page 4 which start at " if said broadcast signal....".

The present invention's transmitter (target unit) is installed or carried by target entity, such as in the building's top of a McDonald restaurant, a child's packet (see claim 2 lines 1-2; abstract lines 2-3). The target unit represents each individual target which is physically in that location. Takahashi's road-vehicle communication unit represents a lot of service provides in its region which are not physically in the road-vehicle communication unit location (see Takahashi's col.8 lines 20-35; col.12, lines 1-15). Therefore, applicant's claim 2 line 1-2 of "at least one target units being installed on target entity and representing at least one target entity", which is different from Takahashi's road-vehicle communication unit in col.12 line 7 of " at positions distanced from respective service providers". Snapp's invention also uses database, position station which is not in the target

is not in the target location (see Snapp's [0078]).

The present invention's target unit is the sign of position (see claim 2, lines 2-3; description [0023], lines 1-3). Takahashi's road-side unit (0201) is a data access point and data storage and exchange station (see Takahashi's claim 1 col.29, lines 4-18; col.2 lines 33-37; col.2 lines 48-53). Therefore, function of target unit in applicant's claim 2 line 2 of "... target units being installed on target entity and representing at least one target entity" is different from road-side unit.

By all appearance, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's statement on examiner's last paragraph of page 3 which start at " regarding Claim1..."

The present invention does not rely on GPS, do not receive and restore any data (claim 2 line 16, description [0021] lines 2-3). Takahashi and Snapp's invention need GPS, and compare received information with restored data (see Takahashi's col.28, lines 17-19; Snapp's page 1, [0015],[0075])

The present invention can be real time tracking and the target could be mobile (see claim 2, lines 13-16). In Takahashi and Snapp's system, target's position information is got from database and cannot be updated real time easily.

Regarding **Claim 5, 6, 7, 8, 10**, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of and reliance on Takahashi and Snapp. Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to the discussion set forth in the previous section.

Regarding **Claim 12**, applicant also directs the examiner's attention to the discussion set in Claim 1, which are:

- 1 The present invention uses target code to identify and select which transmitter it should communicate with first.
- 2 The present invention's tracking unit calculates the bearing from the signal transmitted by respected target (through target unit).
- 3 The present invention's transmitter (target unit) is installed or carried by target entity.
- 4 The present invention's target unit is the sign of position.
- 5 The present invention does not rely on GPS.
- 6 No clear evidence that Snapp's invention has the feature of point-to-point detecting signal's physical direction.

Regarding **Claim 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24**, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of and reliance on Takahashi and. directs the Examiner's attention to the discussion set forth in the previous section.

Regarding **Claim 25**, applicant also directs the examiner's attention to the discussion set in Claim 1, which are:

1. The present invention uses target code to identify and select which transmitter it should communicate with first.
2. The present invention's tracking unit calculates the bearing from the signal transmitted by respected target (through target unit).
3. The present invention's target unit is the sign of position.
4. The present invention does not rely on GPS.
5. No clear evidence that Snapp's invention has the feature of point-to-point detect signal's physical direction.

**B) Claim 3-4 Rejections – 35 USC Sec. 103**

Claims 3-4 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC Sec. 103 as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Snapp, Durst and Neher. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of and reliance on Takahashi and directs the Examiner's attention to the discussion set forth in the previous section.

**C) Claim 9 and 15 Rejections – 35 USC Sec. 103**

Claims 9 and 15 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC Sec. 103 as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Snapp and well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading and reliance on Takahashi and directs the Examiner's attention to the discussion set forth in the previous section.

**D) Claim 11 Rejection**

Claim 11 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC Sec. 103 as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Snapp and Meadows. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading and reliance on Takahashi and directs the Examiner's attention to the discussion set forth in the previous section.

**E) Claim 13 Rejection**

Claim 13 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC Sec. 103 as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Snapp and Neher. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading and reliance on Takahashi and directs the Examiner's attention to the discussion set forth in the previous section.

F) Claim 27 Rejection

Claim 27 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC Sec. 103 as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Snapp and Kennedy. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading and reliance on Takahashi and directs the Examiner's attention to the discussion set forth in the previous section.

G) Claim 28 Rejection

Claim 28 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC Sec. 103 as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Snapp, Kennedy and further in view of Cox. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading and reliance on Takahashi and directs the Examiner's attention to the discussion set forth in the previous section.

In light of Applicant's discussion above regarding Takahashi's inapplicability, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections under 35 USC Sec. 103 be withdrawn and allowance of the claims granted.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter relating to the above-identified patent application.

Respectfully submitted,



Zhongze Bai, Applicant

Submitted: January 27, 2006